

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,614	01/14/2002	Charles Michael Birtcher	06242 USA	2701
23543	7590 04/26/2004		EXAMINER	
	UCTS AND CHEMICA	WALTON, GEORGE L		
PATENT DEPARTMENT 7201 HAMILTON BOULEVARD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	ALLENTOWN, PA 181951501			
			DATE MAILED: 04/26/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		1/V\				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/046,614	BIRTCHER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	George L. Walton	3753				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	ely filed will be considered timely, the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloward	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the order o	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4 & 5.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/046,614

Art Unit: 3753

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6, 9-16 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either patent to Gregg et al (6,199,599 B1, 6,296,026 B1 or 6,457494 B1, see figures 5A-7M) in view of DuRoss et al. The above claims are readable on the patent to either patent to Gregg et al with the single exception of utilizing specific type of valves for process and purge containers, i.e. pneumatic diaphragm valves. The patent to DuRoss et al teaches the above exception. In view of the teaching of DuRoss et al, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to provide the teaching of Ross to either patent to Gregg et al as taught by elements 102, 104, 106 and 302, if desired. Such a modification provides no unobvious or unexpected result. Note that the limitation of claims 9 and 18 is merely obvious design choice in view

Application/Control Number: 10/046,614

Art Unit: 3753

of the purge process of Gregg et al. Figure 8 teaches a non-referenced controller positioned on the top of cabinet 1000.

Claims 7-8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Gregg et al in view of DuRoss et al as applied to claims 1-6, 9-16 and 18-21 above, and further in view of Birtcher et al. The above claims are readable on the above combination of Gregg et al in view of DuRoss et al with the single exception of having an ultrasonic sensor or detector for detecting solvent in a manifold and/or to determine when a bulk container is empty. The patent to Birtcher et al teaches the above exception. In view of the teaching of Birtcher et al, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to provide the above exception to the device of Gregg et al as taught by elements 54, 56 and 58, if desired. Such modification provides no unobvious or unexpected result. Also, Birtcher et al teaches a controller 118 disposed on cabinet 116.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George L. Walton whose telephone number is 703-308-2596. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Scherbel can be reached on 703-308-1272. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3753

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

George L. Walton Primary Examiner Art Unit 3753